



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

In like manner, in any other Case where  $z$  and  $z'$  are two Abscissæ whose Difference as a Measure is  $z$ ; and  $y, y'$  the two Ordinates; the Magnitude of the Figure will be implied by the Magnitudes of the two Polygons which are made from the Sum of the inscribing and circumscribing Elements  $zy$  and  $z'y'$ , although the Figure itself is not to be resolved into any such primogenial-rectangular Elements.

And thus, I think, the Symbol  $z$ , considered as a component Part of the Rectangle  $zy$ , may bear a plain Interpretation; viz. that it is the Measure according to which the Quantity  $z$  is measured; nor can I see that any other Interpretation need to be put upon a Symbol, which, like a Measure, is used only to make other things known, but is of itself for nothing but a Mark.

And what is said of the Elements of the first Resolution, is easily applied to those of a second or third, and so on; the last may always be considered as the Measure of the former and indivisible, although, in respect of the following, it be taken as the Part according to which the Measure was made, and therefore divisible.

*The candid Reader is desired to strike out a Remark of mine, about the Comet of 1556, subjoined to an Observation of the late Comet made at Lisbon, printed in Page 123 of the last Transactions, N<sup>o</sup> 446. The Note was there inserted by some Accident, without my Intention; for I had soon afterwards informed the Society, that the Remark was ill-founded. According to Mr. Bradley's Observations at Oxford, which were not then communicated, the Place at the Time mentioned ought to have been in Long.  $\propto$ .  $13^{\circ}$ .  $21'$ .  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Lat.  $0^{\circ}$ .  $29'$ . South. So that in all probability there happened some Mistake in making this Observation.*

**ERRATA.** P. 213. L. 31. for  $n.n-2$  read  $n.n-2$ .  
P. 222. L. 26. for *being* read *be*.

Printed for T. WOODWARD, at the *Half-Moon*, between the *Two Temple-Gates* in *Fleetstreet*; and C. DAVIS, the Corner of *Pater-noster-row*, next *Warwick-lane*; PRINTERS to the ROYAL SOCIETY. M.DCC.XXXIX.